

rights in Vietnam are improving, I urge him to show it to this Congress, but I doubt that he is telling the truth.

EXPANDING ENERGY HORIZON

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, recently, I took part in a House Natural Resources subcommittee hearing concerning hydropower and exploring its role as a continued source of clean, renewable energy for the future.

In Nebraska, we have benefited from clean, inexpensive and renewable hydropower. These projects in Nebraska's third district serve irrigation, flood control, and recreation activities. Demand for fuel and power continues to grow, giving all sources of domestic resources, including offshore oil fields and ANWR, solar, nuclear, wind, and hydropower, an increasingly important role for the future.

Unfortunately, so many special interest groups have said "no" to virtually every solution, including clean, renewable hydropower, non-emitting nuclear power, clean coal technology, wind power, and certainly responsible domestic exploration.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. We must do better.

NEW ENERGY SOLUTIONS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, the Democratic-led Congress is working for consumers to lower gas prices and to launch a cleaner and more cost-effective energy future that creates new green jobs and that reduces global warming.

For 7 years, Washington Republicans allowed Big Oil to run our Nation's energy policy. The result, high gas prices and continued dependence on oil.

Democrats believe we must diversify our energy sources with bold investments in renewable energy and more efficient technology. Last year, for the first time in three decades, this Congress passed a landmark law that increases fuel efficiency to 35 miles per gallon and that will save American families at least \$700 a year when it takes effect.

We have also passed legislation that repeals billions of dollars in corporate welfare to big oil companies that are currently seeing record profits. Instead, we invest these funds in the renewable energy solutions of the future.

Madam Speaker, the energy policies of the past are not working. It is time that we look for new solutions.

DEVELOP AMERICAN ENERGY

(Mr. AKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, America has a problem because we have not been developing our American energy. The tip of the iceberg is particularly obvious now at \$4 a gallon, but there were warning signs—nuclear reactors, 1960s vintage technology, no new refineries sited in 30 years. That's going back to the Vietnam era. We have not been developing American energy. Why? It is not because we don't have American energy. We have plenty of varieties of American energy that we could be developing, and it is not because we don't have the technology or the innovation to be able to develop American energy.

No. Unfortunately, this is strictly a matter of will. It is a decision, and it is strictly a party-line decision.

Over the last 8 years, Democrats on all kinds of votes on energy have voted 90 percent of the time not to develop American energy. Republicans have voted 90 percent too. Whether it is recycling nuclear fuel, drilling in ANWR or in the Outer Continental Shelf, we need to agree that the time has come to develop American energy.

END OIL'S MONOPOLY

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, if I had a monopoly on apple pies because the law said that my backyard was the only place in town where you could grow apple trees, I would charge whatever I wanted for those apple pies. I would be even more excited when I would start jacking the price way, way up for those apple pies and would make huge, record apple pie profits.

If the government decided that the way to fix that problem would be to give me, and only me, permission to grow one more apple tree in my backyard 10 years from now, well, it would sound pretty ridiculous, right?

Unfortunately, even though the analogy is a little bit simple, that is basically the Republican's plan for high gas prices. Instead of actually creating competition for the oil industry by concentrating on growing renewable energy sources, they just call for a little bit more drilling, giving their friends in the oil industry even more profit.

Well, we shouldn't fall for it. With 2 percent of the world's oil reserves here in the United States, the only way to bring gas prices down is to end oil's monopoly and to start growing apple trees in other people's backyards.

CONGRATULATING FRESNO BULLDOGS

(Mr. RADANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate Fresno State University men's baseball team

as the national champions of the College World Series.

This is the first college baseball national championship win for Fresno State University, and it is, indeed, a Cinderella story for the Bulldogs. Their record was 47 wins and 31 losses. No other college baseball team in the Nation has had 31 losses in the season and has still been able to overcome the odds and win the college baseball national championship.

The outstanding leadership of coach Mike Batesole and the hard work and determination of all of the players, including the College World Series' Most Outstanding Player, Tommy Mendonca, led to this unlikely but well-deserved victory.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Fresno State Bulldogs who went from underdogs to wonder dogs. Go Dogs.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6052, SAVING ENERGY THROUGH PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2008

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1304 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1304

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6052) to promote increased public transportation use, to promote increased use of alternative fuels in providing public transportation, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except

those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 6052 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, June 26, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to:

(a) a measure concerning the Commodity Exchange Act and energy markets; and

(b) a measure concerning the issuance of oil and gas leases on Federal lands or waters.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CASTOR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee, Mr. DIAZ-BALART of Florida. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CASTOR. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1304 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008. The resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and makes in order five amendments submitted for consideration.

The rule also permits the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules relating to two important measures: one, a measure concerning the Commodity Exchange Act and energy markets; and two, a measure concerning the issuance of oil and gas leases on Federal lands or waters. This authority is needed because House rules allow for bills to be considered under suspension only on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays. In order for the House to consider the bill today on Thursday or on any other day, the House must adopt a rule granting specific permission.

Madam Speaker, hardworking Americans all across this great country are being squeezed by this painful Bush economy that has brought on increased costs for housing and for health care.

My colleague from Florida can attest to the rising costs of property insurance for Floridians and other Americans, and of course, gas prices are socking it to our neighbors back home.

Now, many of the reformers here in Congress have been standing up to the White House and have been urging them for years to change direction and to focus on long-term solutions to our energy challenges. But the oil men at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and their Big Oil allies have had a stranglehold over our country's energy policy, and unfortunately, families and businesses across America are paying the price.

Now, some bipartisan progress has been made here in our new-direction Congress over the past year and a half. One of Speaker NANCY PELOSI's first initiatives was to establish a new bipartisan Select Committee on Energy Independence and Climate Change, which has been extremely productive. Democratic reformers also pushed through a historic increase in the required gas mileage of 35 miles per gallon for our cars. Now, better gas mileage for our cars alone should save families from \$700 to \$1,000 per year at the pump and should slash consumption in America by 4 million gallons per day, but it cannot happen soon enough. The sad thing is this technology has existed for years. Cars in Japan travel almost twice as far on a gallon of gas.

What has been missing here in our country is the political leadership to make these necessary changes. So many of the changes we have been fighting for have been blocked by the White House and by their Big Oil allies.

Remember, just 7 years ago, the administration's Energy Task Force met behind closed doors, and it consisted of former oil company executives and of other oil executives, like Ken Lay of Enron. The administration also fought to keep the other identities secret. Saving American families money through innovation was not a priority. Conservation was not a priority—the Vice President made that clear—and public transit and public transportation were not priorities. They were stuck in the past then, and they still are today because what has been their answer to high gas prices? Their recommendations today are the same as they were 7 years ago: More drilling; more of the same.

Now, as the reformers in this Congress continue to fight for a new direction in energy policy, inexplicably, the White House announced yesterday that it opposes today's public transit bill, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act. What a shame on the White House, because expanding public transportation use is one of the most promising ways to reduce energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil.

Now, with the White House's \$4-per-gallon premium, even more commuters are choosing to ride the train and to bus to work rather than to ride alone

in their cars. According to two recent studies, America already saves up to 1½ to 4 billion gallons of gasoline annually. That's more than 11 million gallons of gasoline per day due to public transit.

Ridership across America is way up. 2007 was the highest ridership in public transportation in 50 years. Light rail riders are way up in Denver, Seattle, Portland, Dallas, Fort Worth, San Francisco, Charlotte, and in many other communities. And my colleague from Miami will be pleased to hear that South Florida posted a 20 percent increase over last year in ridership in March and April. Transit agencies are also using more alternative fuels and clean energy technologies that improve the air we breathe and that aid America's energy independence.

Our transit bill on the floor today and under this rule will lower fares and will expand routes and frequency so public transit is an even more attractive alternative during this time of high gas prices.

So I urge my colleagues to continue to stand up to the White House, to support this rule and our first bill today, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act.

Madam Speaker, our second bill today under this rule is entitled "Use It or Lose It." In the bill, we are calling the bluff of the White House, of Big Oil, and of other prominent Republicans who claim that oil companies are being blocked from drilling for oil and gas and that that is somehow related to gas prices. Well, after the White House announced that policy last week, one commentator called it a massive fraudulent and pathetic excuse for an energy policy.

You see, 68 million acres are already leased and have the potential to produce an additional 4.8 million barrels of oil and 4.7 billion cubic feet of natural gas each day. Now, if 68 million acres are already open to drilling, please do not insult the intelligence of the American people by claiming that the oil companies need more.

The truth about America's energy policy and the White House policy is that Big Oil has stockpiled supplies and has pocketed profits. A report has been generated by the Committee on Natural Resources, entitled "The Truth About America's Energy: Big Oil Stockpiles Supplies and Pockets Profits" of June 2008. If American families and businesses are interested, they can obtain this report on the Internet at resourcescommittee.house.gov.

The chairman of the Natural Resources Committee is NICK RAHALL of West Virginia. It's his bill. The bill forces oil and gas companies to either produce, to use it or to release the leases, to lose them, the leases they've been stockpiling. These companies can't obtain new ones unless they can demonstrate that they are diligently using the ones that they already have.

Now, what was particularly interesting, Madam Speaker, is that, last

year, the administration's own energy department, the Energy Information Administration, issued a report that determined that opening more areas would not have a significant impact on gas prices. The 2007 report of the administration's Energy Information Administration, titled "Annual Energy Outlook 2007, with Projections to 2030" can be found at www.eia.doe.gov/oaif/aef/.

In fact, Madam Speaker, just yesterday, the director of the EIA reconfirmed the 2007 report and noted that expanded offshore drilling in the U.S. will not affect oil and natural gas prices very much at all.

I would like to submit yesterday's reconfirmation by the EIA director of the 2007 report.

[From Bloomberg.com, June 25, 2008]

OFFSHORE DRILLING WON'T AFFECT PRICES

MUCH, EIA SAYS

(By Tina Seeley)

Expanded offshore drilling in the U.S. won't affect oil and natural-gas prices much, the head of the Energy Information Administration said.

Guy Caruso, speaking today at a press conference in Washington, said his agency had considered the effect of more drilling in a 2007 report. Higher energy prices this year might change the results, although the time needed for resource development would damp any outcome, he said.

"It does take a long time to develop those resources," Caruso said. "Therefore the price impact is muted by that."

President George W. Bush last week proposed expanded drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf and development of energy sources in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as a response to record prices. Crude-oil futures hit a record \$139.89 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange on June 16.

Senator John McCain of Arizona, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, has expressed support for more drilling. His potential Democratic opponent, Senator Barack Obama of Illinois, opposes more drilling.

"The projections in the OCS access case indicate that access to the Pacific, Atlantic, and eastern Gulf regions would not have a significant impact on domestic crude oil and natural gas production or prices before 2030," the agency said in its 2007 report.

The Energy Information Administration is the statistical arm of the U.S. Energy Department.

Madam Speaker, this sounds all too familiar: the Bush administration ignoring information generated by its own agencies. They've been downplaying, ignoring climate change, possibly intelligence, and now it comes as no surprise that they're playing games on energy policy as well. Thanks to the administration's years of inaction and incompetence, America is left with record prices for consumers and with record profits for oil companies with disastrous national security consequences.

Now, the third bill we will consider today as part of our energy package is a direction to the administration, encouragement, as we continue to stand up to the misguided policies of this White House.

Our third bill today encourages the White House to take more aggressive

action in regulating the energy futures market. This is our first step in tackling the outrageous speculation that is occurring that many experts have noted could help reduce the price of gas at the pump.

This is our package today. We look forward to the debate.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would like to thank my friend from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With gas prices averaging over \$4 a gallon, more and more Americans are using public transportation for their commuting needs. Reports from Metropolitan transit systems throughout the country are showing a significant increase in ridership, in some cases as much as 15 percent—and perhaps even higher—over last year's figures. At the same time, highway vehicle miles traveled declined by 2 percent.

□ 1045

Meeting this increased demand for public transportation is causing a burden on local transit agencies which, just like commuters, must pay record fuel prices to pay for buses and subway trains and light rail.

To help meet this increased demand for public transportation, the underlying legislation, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act, would provide \$1.7 billion in funding to increase public transportation use across the United States. Transit agencies would be able to use those funds to reduce transit fares or expand transit services.

I think this funding is important for communities throughout the country, certainly the community I'm honored to represent. Recently, Miami-Dade County, the 12th largest public transit agency in the country, announced that bus routes would be cut and others adjusted due to the rising cost of fuel. So this at a time when more and more commuters are looking to use public transportation, but public transportation systems are definitely being affected by the rise in energy costs. So it is my hope that the \$36 million this legislation would provide South Florida would help reestablish some of the routes that were cut and would expand others so that commuters would have a more reliable public transportation system.

To further promote the use of public transportation, the legislation establishes a nationwide Federal transit pass benefits program and requires all Federal agencies to offer transit passes to Federal employees working in urbanized areas with fixed route transit systems.

To help alleviate the reliance on gasoline to power our transit systems, the bill will increase the Federal share for clean and alternative fuel transit projects. This will also have the beneficial effect of reducing transportation-related emissions.

I would like to congratulate Chairman OBERSTAR and Ranking Member MICA for working together to draft a bipartisan bill that both sides of the aisle can support. This legislation, the underlying legislation, will be a great benefit to transit systems throughout the country at a time when they are needing additional funding.

Madam Speaker, once again, the bipartisan spirit of the bill, the underlying legislation, never made it past the doors of the Rules Committee. Yesterday, the majority in the Rules Committee only allowed one minority amendment to be debated today, while allowing three amendments from the majority.

Before the new majority took control of the House in January of 2007, they published a document called "A New Direction for America," which set out their promises to the American people. Page 24 of that document says, "Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternative, including a substitute."

Yet here we are today with a process that, contrary to their promise to the American people, blocks a full and fair debate and allows only one minority amendment. Actually, this one minority amendment is the only one the majority has allowed the minority to offer all week. Four bills, one amendment.

Actually, it is more like six bills, one amendment, because this rule will allow the House to debate two additional bills under suspension of the rules, one against speculation in the oil market, and we have to speculate on what it says because we haven't seen it. And the majority's bringing those bills to floor without allowing the minority to offer any amendments or a motion to recommit.

So, at a time when gas prices are hitting almost daily records, the majority should be offering a "full and fair debate" on this critical issue, a debate that considers ideas from both sides of the aisle, of all Members of this House, to help reduce gasoline prices.

Polls across the country are consistent with a recent poll that I saw that said 71 percent want their elected leaders in Washington to focus on "increasing the energy supplies of the United States and lowering the cost of gasoline and electricity." But instead, the majority is offering no-new-energy legislation, obstructing debate, and impeding solutions to the energy crisis, contrary to what the American people wish.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this unfair rule, which continues to block the minority from offering more than one amendment and blocks a thorough debate on the critical energy situation facing the Nation.

At this time, I reserve.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, at this time, I'm very happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this rule as I rise in support of this integral part of a comprehensive approach that has been offered by the majority party to deal with the energy challenges we face today.

It is important that we think of this in a comprehensive fashion because there isn't one silver bullet that's going to solve America's energy challenges, especially when it has taken years to paint us into this corner.

It should be made clear that, first and foremost, this is not just more about increasing supply, not just more drilling. Some of my Republican friends are talking about draining America dry and turning the rest of our energy future over to large oil companies who already, as the gentlewoman from Florida points out, control 68 million acres of land that is available for exploitation. Just ExxonMobil alone had \$40 billion of profit. Were they spending it on existing leases to increase supply? They spent \$36 billion buying back their stock and found, what was it, \$10 million to invest in alternative energy. Significant irony here, I think.

One of the items that we've been involved with in the last 18 months is to work to give Americans more choices for their energy, to beef up opportunities for wind, solar, and tidal, in addition to those 68 million acres already available.

We're working on new technology. Three times the House has passed legislation, I'm pleased to say, that has included my provision to close the Hummer loophole that actually subsidizes the purchase of the largest, most energy inefficient, expensive vehicles like the Hummer and, instead, would spend that money to encourage alternatives like hybrid technology.

We need to be serious about not wasting more oil than any country in the world. You know, it's ironic, after the Democrats seized control of Congress we had to fight with this administration and our friends on the other side of the aisle to just increase fuel efficiency standards to 35 miles a gallon, that basically remained unchanged for 35 years. Our Republican friends, when they were in control, actually made it illegal to even study increasing fuel efficiency standards. It is stunning when we think today of the price Americans are paying at \$4 a gallon that they refused to allow us to even study making cars more gasoline efficient.

Well, we broke through that. The irony is now George Bush is claiming credit for something that he resisted, but even if we give George Bush credit for what we forced him to do, it took George Bush longer to get to 35 miles to a gallon than it took Jack Kennedy to get Americans to the moon.

We hear about now, all of the sudden, they're flip-flopping and interested in more offshore drilling. This is interesting. George Bush, the first, put in

place an executive order that prohibited it. George Bush, the second, reaffirmed it at the insistence of his brother, Jeb Bush, as my friend from Florida well knows. The President could now overturn that executive order if he wished. The Governor of Florida, since Florida controls the first three miles of State land, could start drilling 3 miles off the Florida coast if they were really excited about doing it.

Well, it's important that we've got this legislation today about using or losing oil leases. I strongly support the part of the puzzle that deals with conservation, because with less than 3 percent of the world's oil reserves we'll never be able to drill our way out of this. The irony is that even if we started drilling more today, every expert, every expert agrees that it will take 7 to 10 years for any of this oil to trickle into the system.

In this legislation, we are putting more resources to help mass transit, putting more resources to give consumers choices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. CASTOR. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This is part of a comprehensive approach. Democrats have been working since we returned to power to increase fuel efficiency and with other alternatives for energy.

I welcome a broad, far-ranging debate about what Republicans did when they were in control for a dozen years in the House, especially the 6 years of the Bush administration, they were in complete control, their energy bill of 2005 when they were running the show, in contrast with what we've already been able to accomplish with just the last 18 months and what we propose to do in the future.

Support the rule. Support the underlying bill. I look forward to that debate.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

CONGRATULATING THE FRESNO STATE BULLDOGS

I'd like to rise in opposition to this rule, but before I do that, I'd like to take just a moment to recognize the accomplishments of the Diamond Dogs of Fresno State. The Central Valley's own Fresno State Bulldogs entered the College World Series and left as world champions.

The Bulldogs, who barreled into the College World Series with nothing more than the burden of proof on their side, showed not only that they belonged in the series but that they were nothing less than the best team in the Nation.

The Fresno State Bulldogs have triumphed in the face of adversity and have achieved the greatest victory in College World Series history. Their achievement has spoken louder than words and will become a testament to

all those who seek to be better, to reach further, and to soar higher than ever before.

I share this, not only because of the great sense of pride I feel from the Fresno State Bulldogs' outstanding accomplishment, but because I believe their story is truly an inspiration for all. Our Fresno State Bulldogs' story is not one of miracles. It is a testimony of the strength of the human spirit. It is a force that can overcome any obstacle, even when faced with seemingly insurmountable odds.

Congratulations to the Fresno State Bulldogs.

Now, Madam Speaker, I was sitting here, waiting to congratulate the Fresno State Bulldogs, and unfortunately, we ran out of time on that. But I had the opportunity to be able to listen to the other side of the aisle's arguments, and I can't help but think back to 2006, because there's a lot of hot air here in Washington, as we know, but in 2006 the Democrats said, if you put us in power, we're going to get our troops out of Iraq, we're going to surrender in Iraq, and we're going to just turn it over to the terrorists in Iraq.

Two years later, we're still in Iraq, Madam Speaker, because the Republicans stood up to the Democrat majority and said we're going to try to win and achieve victory in Iraq. We're still trying to do that, and it's very difficult.

The other thing that the Democrats also promised in 2006 is that they had a real plan to lower gas prices. Well, in 2 years, we have managed to double the price of gasoline, and in California, we're getting close to paying \$5 a gallon. So I'm assuming that today's rule is the unveiling of this plan to lower gas prices.

However, the plan that you have before us and all that we continue to hear is that we blame the Texas oil men in the White House. Give me a break. You must have better legislation than that today. If this is your plan, to blame the White House, to blame oil speculators, to blame oil companies, American oil companies don't control the world's oil supply. The world's oil supply is controlled by foreign governments that, for the most part, are hostile towards us.

□ 1100

So if you have a plan to deal with these foreign governments, hopefully, we can see it today. If you have a plan that's going to somehow miraculously lower oil prices, maybe we're going to see that today because, right now, your plan is not working real well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, today, the price of gas is \$5 a gallon, and we would like to see the plan today, Madam Speaker. I hope that this rule will unveil this plan, but unfortunately, the legislation that's before us today is a scam. It's a complete and total scam.

The longer that we continue to blame the White House, the longer that we continue to blame the oil companies, the longer that we continue to blame everyone else but ourselves—we ourselves are to blame; we should look in the mirror. This Congress should take dramatic steps to open up supply that would bridge ourselves to the next generation of energy, Madam Speaker. That's what we should be doing here today.

The American people aren't going to buy these arguments, but they are going to continue to be buying \$5 gas until we decide, as a Congress, to do something about it.

With that, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, a leader on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to take a moment to make it clear that I support H. Res. 1304. It provides for a structured rule, and I fully support the rule.

As I was sitting here, I had to change my remarks in my head because, as I was listening to Mr. NUNES, I could not help but think about the people in my district of Baltimore, only 40 miles away from here, who aren't worried about whose fault it is. What they are concerned about are solutions to their problems so they can get back and forth to work, so that they can go shopping, so that they can do the things that they would normally do. I think that this rule and then this bill are a major step in the right direction in trying to help them.

In a sense, I kind of agree with Mr. NUNES. I'm not anxious to do a lot of blaming because the people I represent get tired of watching C-SPAN; they get tired of the back and forth, and they simply want the Congress to come together to find solutions to their problems.

Yes, it is true that gas prices have risen to more than \$4 per gallon. The Joint Economic Committee, on which I also serve, has reported that households can expect to spend as much as 25 percent more on gasoline this year than last year. This is a tremendous burden for the many households that I represent, and they simply cannot bear it. If, as I fear, these prices represent a new paradigm, we, as a nation, must urgently assess how we can adjust to ensure our economy can continue to grow while we conserve energy.

I believe that one of the best adjustments we can make is to support the

increased use of public transit, which already saves the United States the equivalent of 4.2 billion gallons of gasoline per year. Unfortunately, in many areas, such as my hometown of Baltimore where public transportation already provides more than 93 million annual trips, transit agencies face budget constraints that are limiting their ability to grow to meet the new demand.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the Federal contribution to public transit services totals less than 20 percent of all revenue accruing to these services. Local governments contribute nearly half of the revenue needed to provide public transit, but these governments are facing funding constraints.

H.R. 6052 would provide an additional \$1.7 billion in Federal funding for public transportation in fiscal years 2008 and 2009, funding that is essential to ensure that we can keep our Nation moving while conserving fuel.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill that increases Federal investments in public transit.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. It is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished lady from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, today, the national average for a gallon of gas has reached \$4.07. With your average vehicle tank holding 18 gallons, that translates to \$75 to fill your tank. This is on top of skyrocketing food costs and, now, increases in both our natural gas and electricity bills at home.

Many American families simply cannot afford these prices. Yet we stand on this floor without allowing debate on a comprehensive solution for the American people. This country is tired of partisan maneuvering and is tired of Congress just saying "no."

Madam Speaker, Americans are downright mad. Some may argue that high gas prices are an incentive to make Americans drive less or that high energy costs are an incentive for businesses and homeowners to utilize more green practices. High energy and gas prices also cause businesses and jobs to move offshore where natural gas is cheaper.

I firmly believe in investing in technology that will move us away from our Nation's dependence on petroleum, but during this transitional period, we must also increase our domestic supply and fuel our economy. No one can deny that energy is something that we all use and need. Americans expect this Congress to do everything within our power to address these high gas and energy prices.

Madam Speaker, we should not leave here for the Fourth of July recess without increasing our own natural resources. Bring relief to the American people. Keep our Nation competitive and open for business.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the

gentleman from Vermont, a member of the powerful Rules Committee, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my colleague from Florida, and I admire her leadership on energy issues, among many other issues.

Madam Speaker, I would like to speak about two things. One is an amendment that I offered to this bill that's been incorporated into the manager's amendment.

This bill recognizes that one of the steps that we have to take, long overdue, is to build up our public transportation system. It's going to provide relief to commuters; it's going to help our environment; it's going to create jobs.

The amendment that I offered and that Mr. OBERSTAR incorporated into the manager's amendment would allow funds to be used by local transportation authorities, like the Chittenden County Transportation Authority, to retrofit their equipment and facilities in order to improve energy efficiency and to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Those would be specific purposes for which authorized funds may be used.

Specifically, it means that an organization like the Chittenden County Transit Authority in the Burlington area could retrofit their buses and be more fuel efficient. They've been trying to do that. A shortage of funds has kept them from achieving all of their goals. It would also allow the transportation authority in that State and in other States to build a natural gas pump station locally. This, we believe, is a very important part of the legislation presented to you.

Second, we're having, in the process of this debate, an ongoing discussion about energy. The fact is—and I think we all know this—in the past when we've had crises around energy, it has never produced a lasting and durable response. There has been an immediate response but nothing lasting, whether it was after the OPEC organization in the early '70s, after the Gulf war or after Katrina. Usually, a crisis does produce a response. It hasn't. We know the time has passed as to when we can look the other way.

What accounts for the high cost of energy? The reality is there are a number of factors. The weak dollar is one, because of our current account deficit. Speculation is another. There has been a massive increase in speculation in the commodities markets in general, in oil in particular, where it's gone from folks who are delivering the product or who are receiving the product, to financial speculators who see that there is money in playing that game.

There has also been an increased demand with globalization. China and India are building their economies. They're using more energy. But there has also been a significant failure of leadership to move us away from an oil-dependent economy. The reality is, what we need to be doing here in Congress is addressing both the short-term

steps that we can take as well as the long-term need for a new energy policy.

So what are the specific things that we can do in the short term? One, we can stop filling up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and diminish demand. We've done that. That will have a positive impact in reducing demand. Second, we can limit speculation. We should be putting limits on how much the speculative players can influence price, not only because there is significant expert testimony that that is adding a premium to the cost of a gallon of gas or to a gallon of home heating fuel, but that it also is creating a potential bubble where innocent participants and pension funds may see the value of their assets suddenly diminish when the market goes south. So we will be considering later anti-speculation legislation that will be helpful as well.

Third, the "Use It or Lose It" legislation. Our friends on the other side have been making a big argument about the need to increase production. You know, there is not any disagreement here that part of our transition from an oil-based economy to a carbon-free economy has to include the continued production and use of carbon-based fuels, including oil. No question about it. The issue here is whether or not we need to increase lands that are available when we have 68 million acres already under lease, permitted, where all the oil companies need to do in order to produce more oil is to put metal to the Earth. This is 68 million acres, Madam Speaker, as you know, that is both onshore and offshore.

So the argument is that we need to be opening up a national park and starting to drill there or into other coastal areas when we have 68 million acres already available, but for reasons that only the oil companies—the leaseholders—are aware, those are not producing needed oil and natural gas for our citizens. It's estimated that the amount of oil that's available under those 68 million acres is 4.8 million barrels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CASTOR. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. So what we need to do that also is a long-term energy policy is to increase mileage standards and take away the tax breaks that are going to the oil companies and steer them to alternative agency. Incidentally, ExxonMobil, which made \$40 billion this year, spent \$32 billion buying its stock back rather than producing oil on these leaseholds.

We also have to have a new energy policy so we can keep our money at home. We're sending \$1 trillion to the oil-producing states like Russia, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela, not particularly our friends. If we keep that money at home, we're going to strengthen our economy.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, due to higher fuel costs, the two largest utility companies in Oklahoma recently announced a monthly rate increase of \$16 on average, with more increases expected this fall. This is just the latest example of how the pain at the pump is spreading to the other necessities of life. This added expense for fuel in business is being passed along to consumers, who are now being hit with a double dose of soaring prices.

However, when given the opportunity to pass meaningful energy legislation, this majority has chosen to introduce the "Bus Fares for Bureaucrats" bill, which will spend \$1.7 billion in tax revenues to reduce fares in public transportation systems. While I'm sure this will benefit the bureaucrats in D.C. who write these laws, I'm more concerned about the farmers in western Oklahoma, where there is no public transportation system to speak of.

As of today, my constituents are paying upwards of \$4 a gallon for gasoline to fill their cars and \$4.66 a gallon for diesel to fill their tractors and trucks. Are we to tell them that they not only have to pay higher prices for gas and electricity but that now they have to subsidize people in big cities with the luxury of access to public transportation?

As long as demand continues to rise, the price for oil will continue to climb without increasing supply. The answer to this problem is clear: We must increase our domestic supply of oil by allowing the exploration of new oil reserves and by increasing the capacity of our refineries.

A recent Los Angeles Times Bloomberg poll stated that 68 percent of registered voters support opening up more land for oil and gas drilling, including off the Nation's coast. It's time for this majority to start listening to the demands of the American people and to open up more land for oil exploration.

It's also necessary to encourage the development of alternative energy, such as wind or nuclear power. Oklahoma is currently the number nine generator of wind power in this country, producing 689 megawatts per year. There are other States that have the potential to produce more wind power than that but that choose not to install wind turbines because they consider them unsightly.

However, I guarantee you that any Oklahoma wheat farmer who earns money from both his crops and the wind turbines on his land will tell you his wind turbines are beautiful.

□ 1115

Right now, America produces 20 percent of its energy needs from nuclear power while France produces 78 percent, 78 percent. That's 78 percent less energy they need to import from other countries. So, not only are they able to produce more than three-quarters of their electricity needs in France, they are able to do so in a clean, efficient

manner with minimal harmful emissions.

This leads me to my most important point. If electricity that lights your house or the gas that powers your car is produced in America, new jobs are created, and we are becoming less dependent on foreign oil. It's time for America to get back in the business of energy production. I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition on H.R. 5656, "To Repeal the Ban on Acquiring Alternative Fuels Act," so we can bring this essential piece of legislation to the House floor for a vote. The rising cost of gasoline is the single biggest challenge we face in this country, as every American who has been to the pump in the last few months knows, and it's time for Congress to rise to the challenge to come up with real solutions.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS).

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Thank you for yielding time.

It's interesting that we stand here and talk about public transportation. I represent northeast Tennessee, a rural area, and I tell you the people who live in northeast Tennessee don't have access to public transportation.

People in rural America are hurting. Young families are hurting. Senior adults are hurting. Small businesses are hurting. Sheriffs' departments and police departments are hurting.

Let me tell you about two groups. The first is Vern Long. Vern lives in Jefferson County, Tennessee. I met with him last Saturday when I was back home in the district. Vern is an Iraqi war veteran. He has a wife and a child. He lives in Jefferson County and drives to Knoxville, Tennessee to work every day. He makes \$8 an hour. He's an apprentice electrician. He wants to go on to be an electrician. He has to drive into Knoxville, and it costs him \$90 a week, \$90 a week to fill up his tank. He told me, "Congressman, if the Congress doesn't pass an energy bill to bring these gas prices down, I may have to go on welfare and quit my job. And I want to protect my family. I want to be there to protect my future."

Let me tell you about Sheriff Steve Burns. Sheriff Burns is from Greene County, Tennessee. I met with him last Saturday. He told me he put his budget together for Greene County this past February and March. He said, if it passes in the county commission as he presented it, he will be \$50,000 in the hole because of high gas prices.

Public transportation bills to send bureaucrats to work in Washington will not help rural America. America is hurting. We need an energy policy. We don't need more excuses, and we don't need more bills that make it sound good and look like we're trying to do something here. We need an energy that actually uses American oil, natural gas, coal-to-liquid technology,

clean coal technology. We need to use nuclear power. Yes, we need green energy. We need all of the above. The American people are demanding action, real action, not excuses from Washington.

Please, I beg the majority. Let's take this burden of high gas prices off of people like Vern Long and off of sheriffs' departments like Sheriff Steve Burns'. Let's pass some real energy legislation. No more excuses.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that, under the underlying bill, we provide extensive assistance to rural America. It is clear that folks in rural America oftentimes bear the brunt of high gas prices brought on by this unfortunate Bush economy and by the failure of leadership over the past 6 to 8 years. The underlying bill provides over \$100 million for rural America to expand the alternative use through public transportation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank again my distinguished friend for having yielded me the time this morning, and I thank all of those who have come to debate on this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, the problem is, when the process by which legislation is brought to the floor is unfair, especially when the issue being dealt with by the legislation is as important as is the issue today, many Members' ideas are shut out, oftentimes ideas on which they have worked for months or years, and in this instance, they are ideas and proposals to bring down the cost of energy and the cost of gasoline. That's why process, something that may sound often theoretical, can have a significant impact on policy. In this instance, an unfair process is denying Members the opportunity to bring concrete ideas to the floor, for debate, to lower the price of energy. That's one of the reasons we are so disturbed, why we think it's so unfortunate that the process on an issue as important as this that the majority has chosen to utilize to bring this legislation to the floor is so unfair.

On almost a daily basis, Madam Speaker, the cost of gasoline is breaking new records. Americans are now paying over \$4 a gallon for gasoline. Yet the majority fails to bring legislation to the floor that will actually lower gas prices or decrease our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

We believe it's time for the House to debate ideas for lowering prices at the pump and for addressing the skyrocketing cost of gasoline. So, today, I urge my colleagues to vote with me to defeat the previous question so this House can finally consider real solutions to rising energy costs. If the previous question is defeated, I will move to amend the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 5656, which would re-

peal the ban on acquiring advanced alternatives fuels, introduced by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas. This legislation would reduce the price of gasoline by allowing the Federal Government to procure advanced alternative fuels derived from diverse sources like oil shale, tar sands, and coal-to-liquid technology.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, by voting "no" on the previous question, Members can take a stand against high fuel prices and in favor of debating legislation to actually deal with that crisis. I encourage a "no" vote on this previous question.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The reformers in this Congress are working for solutions and are casting aside the politics of the past, and for the first time in a decade, they are setting the right priorities for American families. See, American families are caught in this very unfortunate Bush economy that is squeezing them, whether it's health care, the rising cost of housing, and, of course, gas prices.

This New Direction Congress, led by Democrats, is on the side of middle class families, and we are responding to their call for change in the direction of this country. But, Madam Speaker, it has not been easy. It has not been easy in these final years of the Bush administration. A number of times we have stood up to the administration to repeal the massive subsidies to the big oil companies and instead take that money and invest it in new renewable energies and biofuel technologies because one of the most promising ways to end our dependence on foreign oil is in the creation of renewable energy sources. But we were blocked by the White House and Big Oil.

But we are not going to give up. If we had given up, the reformers in this Congress would not have been able to push through the first increase in fuel economy standards in over 30 years. The increase of 35 miles per gallon for each automobile will save American families \$700 to \$1,000 at the pump when fully implemented.

American families are clamoring for a bold, new direction in energy policy. It is vital to their family budgets, and we know now, as, unfortunately, the leaders of the country have had to traipse over to Saudi Arabia and ask for more oil, that this is vital to our national security. So the contrast between the policies of the past and our forward-looking efforts could not be more clear.

But, Madam Speaker, it is so easy to be frustrated by the misguided policies of this administration over the past 8 years and by their political gimmicks where they pretend that drilling for oil in new areas is the answer to high gas prices when their very own Energy Department dismisses the idea as untrue. After all, there are 68 million acres already open and currently leased to oil and gas companies. So why here at the end of this administration would we give Big Oil even more?

Madam Speaker, American families are counting on us. So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to back up your rhetoric with support for our bipartisan bills today, to provide American families with greater opportunities to use public transit by lowering fares and by increasing the frequency of buses and trains in their neighborhoods. Reject the oil drilling gimmick for what it is, and urge this President to address the oil speculators that are causing a run-up in high gas prices. My colleagues, stand up to the powerful interests, and end the practice of using energy policy as a way to support Big Oil. Instead, help our families; help our communities; enable researchers and innovators to lead us to a cleaner, safer, and more affordable future.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and of the underlying legislation. Chart a new direction for America on energy. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1304 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5656) to repeal a requirement with respect to the procurement and acquisition of alternative fuels. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on House Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute if offered by Representative WAXMAN, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It

is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the

previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules with regard to H. Res. 1291.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 198, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Ackerman	Gordon	Neal (MA)
Allen	Green, Al	Oberstar
Altmire	Green, Gene	Obey
Andrews	Grijalva	Olver
Arcuri	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Baca	Hall (NY)	Pallone
Baird	Hare	Pascarell
Baldwin	Harman	Pastor
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bean	Herseth Sandlin	Perlmutter
Becerra	Higgins	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Berman	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Berry	Hirono	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hodes	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Holden	Reichert
Blumenauer	Holt	Reyes
Boren	Honda	Richardson
Boswell	Hooley	Rodriguez
Boucher	Hoyer	Ross
Boyd (FL)	Inlee	Rothman
Boyda (KS)	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Braley (IA)	Jackson-Lee	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Salazar
Butterfield	Jefferson	Sanchez, Linda
Capps	Johnson (GA)	T.
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Jones (OH)	Sarbanes
Carnahan	Kagen	Schakowsky
Carney	Kanjorski	Schiff
Carson	Kaptur	Schwartz
Castle	Kennedy	Scott (GA)
Castor	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Cazayoux	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Chandler	Kind	Sestak
Clarke	Klein (FL)	Shea-Porter
Clay	Kucinich	Sherman
Cleaver	Langevin	Shuler
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Conyers	Lee	Slaughter
Cooper	Levin	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Costello	Lipinski	Solis
Courtney	Loeb sack	Speier
Cramer	Lofgren, Zoe	Spratt
Crowley	Lowe	Stark
Cuellar	Lynch	Sutton
Cummings	Mahoney (FL)	Tanner
Davis (AL)	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Davis (CA)	Markey	Taylor
Davis (IL)	Marshall	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Matsui	Tierney
Delahunt	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
DeLauro	McCollum (MN)	Tsongas
Dicks	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Dingell	McIntyre	Udall (NM)
Doggett	McNerney	Van Hollen
Doyle	McNulty	Velázquez
Edwards (MD)	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Edwards (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Walz (MN)
Ellison	Melancon	Wasserman
Ellsworth	Michaud	Schultz
Emanuel	Miller (NC)	Waters
Engel	Miller, George	Watson
Eshoo	Mitchell	Watt
Etheridge	Mollohan	Waxman
Farr	Moore (KS)	Weiner
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Welch (VT)
Filner	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Foster	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (OH)
Frank (MA)	Murphy, Patrick	Woolsey
Giffords	Murtha	Wu
Gillibrand	Nadler	Yarmuth

NAYS—198

Aderholt	Biggert	Bono Mack
Akin	Bilbray	Boozman
Alexander	Billirakis	Boustany
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Blackburn	Broun (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Brown (SC)
Bartlett (MD)	Boehner	Brown-Waite,
Barton (TX)	Bonner	Ginny

Buchanan	Hobson	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Platts
Buyer	Hulshof	Poe
Calvert	Hunter	Porter
Camp (MI)	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Pryce (OH)
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Putnam
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Carter	Jones (NC)	Ramstad
Chabot	Jordan	Regula
Childers	Keller	Rehberg
Coble	King (IA)	Renzi
Cole (OK)	King (NY)	Reynolds
Conaway	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	Kirk	Rogers (KY)
Cubin	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Davis (KY)	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, David	LaHood	Roskam
Davis, Tom	Lamborn	Royce
Deal (GA)	Lampson	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Latham	Sali
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Saxton
Diaz-Balart, M.	Latta	Scalise
Donnelly	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Drake	Linder	Sessions
Dreier	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Duncan	Lucas	Shays
Ehlers	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
Emerson	E.	Shuster
English (PA)	Mack	Simpson
Everett	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Fallin	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Feeney	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Ferguson	McCaul (TX)	Souder
Flake	McCotter	Stearns
Fortenberry	McCrery	Sullivan
Fossella	McHenry	Tancredo
Fox	McHugh	Terry
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Tiahrt
Gallely	Rodgers	Tiberi
Garrett (NJ)	Mica	Turner
Gerlach	Miller (FL)	Upton
Gilchrest	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gingrey	Miller, Gary	Walden (OR)
Gohmert	Moran (KS)	Walsh (ND)
Goode	Murphy, Tim	Wamp
Goodlatte	Musgrave	Weldon (FL)
Granger	Myrick	Weller
Graves	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Hall (TX)	Nunes	Whitfield (KY)
Hastings (WA)	Paul	Wilson (NM)
Hayes	Pearce	Wilson (SC)
Heller	Pence	Wittman (VA)
Hensarling	Peterson (PA)	Wolf
Herger	Petri	Young (AK)
Hill	Pickering	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Burgess	Forbes	Space
Cannon	McDermott	Stupak
Davis, Lincoln	Rush	

□ 1152

Messrs. ADERHOLT, BONNER and DONNELLY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—230

Abercrombie	Altmire	Baca
Ackerman	Andrews	Baird
Allen	Arcuri	Baldwin

Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cumming
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herse
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—196

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Billbray
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)

Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David

Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Ingalls (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas

Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Muggrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Cannon
Forbes
McDermott

Price (GA)
Rangel
Rush

Space
Taylor

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1202

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, on roll-call Nos. 462 and 463, I was unavoidably detained on legislative business away from the Capitol. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN GI FORUM ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1291, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1291.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billbray
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings

Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof

Hunter
Ingalls (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary